

# Index of Figures and Tables

---

Table 1.	Data types in the CRRPD. Based on StreamNet database structure (www.streamnet.org) with California-specific changes..	4
Figure 1.	CRRPD general structure.	7
Figure 2.	Amounts spent on restoration projects by watershed	10
Table 2.	Total amounts spent on restoration projects by year (corrected for inflation to 1999 dollars)..	11
Table 3.	Average rates charged for budget items in Siskiyou County (corrected for inflation to 1999 dollars).	12
Table 1.	Average annual rates of return for various financial instruments (1947-1996)	23
Table 2.	Summary of ESA steps and economic contribution to decisions	26
Figure 1.	Pyramid of information	29
Figure 1.	Cumulative effect	34
Figure 2.	Competing projects — large budget case.	35
Figure 3.	Competing projects — small budget case	35
Figure 4.	Discrete uncertain outcomes — small budget case	35
Figure 5.	$E(A+B) - kV(A+B)$ — small budget case	36
Figure 6.	A decision tree	37
Figure 7.	Maximin strategy — small budget	38
Table 1.	Non-USACE restoration cost studies	42
Table 2.	Comparable construction costs	43
Table 3.	Primary factors affecting restoration costs	43
Table 1.	Example project costs and unit costs for six road decommissions.	53
Figure 1.	Fish can't get through here?	58
Figure 2.	Angle iron fish ladder	59
Table 1.	Angle iron fish ladder average costs..	59
Table 2.	Chimney block fish ladder average costs.	60
Figure 3.	Correctly installed chimney block fish ladder	60
Table 3.	Welding baffles into culvert — average costs	60
Figure 4.	Baffles welded into a culvert.	61
Figure 5.	Backing water into the culvert by use of drop structures	61
Table 4.	Backing water into culvert — average costs	61
Table 5.	Average cost of annual maintenance	62
Table 6.	Longevity of structures	63
Table 7.	Putting it all together (initial cost + maintenance + longevity)	63
Table 8.	Average costs of bridge design.	64
Table 9.	Total costs and longevity of four different bridge types.	65
Figure 6.	Example of a wood stringer bridge	65
Figure 7.	Example of a pre-fabricated concrete bridge.	65
Figure 8.	Example of a railroad bridge	66
Figure 9.	Example of a steel bridge.	66
Table 10.	Cost and longevity comparison for three additional options	66
Figure 10.	Example of a bottomless arch	67
Figure 11.	Example of a buried culvert.	67
Figure 12.	Example of a stream ford.	68
Table 11.	Comparison of options (initial cost + maintenance + longevity)	68

Table 12.	What to consider and know when evaluating a stream crossing for fish passage problems. . . . .	69
Figure 1.	A diverted watercourse (Ackerman Creek, CA). . . . .	72
Figure 2.	Three culverts which are scheduled to be replaced with a railroad flatcar bridge in 2001 (Ackerman Creek, CA). . . . .	72
Figure 3.	A culvert and downspout installed on top of an old Humboldt crossing (Little North Fork Navarro River, CA). . . . .	72
Figure 4.	Degree of crossing removal may involve assessment of more than just fisheries issues. . . .	73
Figure 5.	Tractor crushed logging debris at road or skid trail crossings . . . . .	73
Figure 6.	Incorporating large woody debris . . . . .	73
Figure 7.	Incorporating large woody debris . . . . .	74
Figure 8.	A rolling dip draining surface runoff onto a fillslope covered with strawmulch (Soda Springs Road, Albion River Watershed, CA) . . . . .	74
Figure 9.	Example of a rock-armored crossing. . . . .	75
Figure 10.	Frame bridge. . . . .	75
Figure 11.	Steel-decked bridge. . . . .	75
Figure 12.	Example of a railroad flatcar bridge installed with riprap along the channel. . . . .	76
Figure 13.	Example of bridge installation bulkheading . . . . .	77
Table 1.	Sources and magnitude of road-related sediment delivery in selected Northern California watersheds . . . . .	82
Table 2.	Summary road erosion inventory and sediment yield data for selected, inventoried watersheds in Oregon and Northern California. . . . .	84
Table 3.	Road sediment source inventory and assessment methods (PWA, 2000) . . . . .	86
Figure 1.	Five-step process for storm-proofing forest roads . . . . .	88
Figure 2.	Controls on costs . . . . .	90
Figure 3.	Developing cost estimates from Level 3 field inventory data . . . . .	95
Table 4.	Sample techniques and costs for decommissioning and upgrading rural roads . . . . .	96
Table 5.	Cost worksheet for high and high/moderate sites . . . . .	98
Table 6.	Analysis of data from five road decommissioning proposals, Northern California watersheds (1998 and 2000). . . . .	99
Table 7.	Typical road upgrading and road decommissioning costs . . . . .	100
Figure 1.	Wind River watershed, Skamania County, Washington. . . . .	105
Figure 2.	1944 U.S. Department of War aerial photograph of the Upper Wind River (river mile 20–25), Skamania County, Washington. . . . .	105
Figure 3.	The Mining Reach riparian and stream channel restoration project, Skamania County, Washington . . . . .	108
Figure 4.	Trout Creek restoration, Wind River watershed, Skamania County, Washington . . . . .	108
Table 1.	Typical restoration costs . . . . .	109
Table 2.	Project budgets: Trout Creek, Panther Creek and Mine Reach. . . . .	110
Table 1.	Summary data regarding cover structure projects (n = 37). . . . .	122
Table 2.	Multiple regression results . . . . .	123
Table 3.	Summary data regarding streamside vegetation projects (n = 11) . . . . .	125
Table 4.	Summary data regarding erosion control projects (n = 12) . . . . .	125
APPENDIX 1.	Example Project . . . . .	133
Table A1.	Estimated budget: South Fork Garcia River instream structure component . . . . .	134
Figure A1.	South Fork Garcia River proposed instream work survey # TU 981 (surveyed October 1998) . . . . .	135
Figure 1.	Streambed rehabilitation project under construction. Project design team ecologist checking invert of instream boulder wedge. (Case study project 4) . . . . .	144

## Index of Figures and Tables

Table 1.	Typical tasks associated with project design, construction and follow-through . . . . .	153
Figure 2.	Excavation of defined floodplain for O'Grady creek (Case study project 5). . . . .	155
Figure 3.	Crane overcomes tight construction access for delivery truck (Case study project 4). . . . .	155
Figure 4.	Silt fence along the Sammamish River . . . . .	156
Figure 5.	Silt curtain in the Sammamish River . . . . .	156
Figure 6.	Bank stabilization work on Bear Creek to improve salmon habitat. The star on the watershed map indicates the approximate project location. . . . .	159
Table 2.	Conrad Olson Farm project costs. . . . .	159
Table 3.	Bear Creek at Conover bank stabilization and LWD project costs . . . . .	161
Figure 7.	The two photos to the left show the streambed work in progress. The photo on the right was taken about one week after construction. . . . .	162
Table 4.	Rutherford Creek stream rehabilitation project costs . . . . .	163
Figure 8.	Culvert replacement for fish passage at O'Grady Creek (Photos taken immediately before and after construction) . . . . .	164
Figure 9.	Looking downstream from the new culvert at the rebuilt reach of O'Grady Creek after construction. The streambed here is about three feet higher than the eroded streambed. Buried boulder wedges create a stepped reach of pools for fish passage. LWD was added for habitat diversity. . . . .	165
Table 5.	O'Grady Creek culvert replacement project costs . . . . .	166
Figure 10.	Problems associated with the alluvial fan reach on O'Grady Creek . . . . .	167
Figure 11.	Earthwork to create new stream alignment with floodplain bench, May 2000. Wetland area is to the left side of the photo, and the side channel of the Green River is behind the trees in the background. . . . .	167
Figure 12.	Volunteer planting event for O'Grady Creek stream enhancement project, November 2000. The new stream channel is visible as it meanders toward the sidechannel of the Green River. It was not connected to flowing water until May 2002. . .	168
Table 6.	O'Grady Creek wetland and stream habitat enhancements project costs. . . . .	169
Figure 1.	Total screen and project costs (primarily California projects) . . . . .	173
Figure 2.	Recent large facility screen costs in California . . . . .	174
Figure 3.	Hydraulic and biological relationships near screens (lab research) . . . . .	175
Figure 4.	CCWD Los Vaqueros pumping plant intake sampling net (field research). . . . .	176
Figure 5.	Universal stream bottom retrievable fish screen . . . . .	177
Figure 6.	Operational flexibility (adjustable overflow gates allow proper ladder hydraulics with 3-foot pool fluctuation). . . . .	178
Figure 7.	RD 1004's operational flexibility helps insure project reliability in extreme conditions. . .	178
Figure 8.	PCG-P's facility behind significant cofferdam. . . . .	179
Figure 9.	Airburst screen cleaning system . . . . .	179
Figure 10.	Improperly cleaned and maintained screen. . . . .	179
Figure 11.	Debris-clogged screen . . . . .	180
Figure 12.	Water backwash cleaning system with clogged spray nozzle. . . . .	180
Figure 13.	Andreotti fish screen 9/96 (collapsed screen). . . . .	180
Figure 14.	Butte Creek Farms screen 4/12/99 (screen failure). . . . .	180
Figure 15.	Corroded screen — dissimilar metals and poor water quality (outside view). . . . .	181
Figure 16.	Corroded screen (inside view) . . . . .	181
Figure 17.	Grit damage to the screen cleaning system. . . . .	181
Figure 18.	Retrievable cylindrical screen (two views). . . . .	182
Figure 19.	Small screen state-of-the-art . . . . .	183

Table 1.	Fogarty Fish Screen 8-1-96 (revised 8-8-97 & 3-18-98) . . . . .	188
Figure 1.	Washington State fish screen costs, 1 to 15 CFS . . . . .	191
Figure 2.	Washington State fish screen costs, 1 to 15 CFS ( $\pm$ 25%) . . . . .	192
Figure 3.	Washington State fish screen costs, 1 to 58 CFS ( $\pm$ 25%) . . . . .	192
Figure 4.	Washington State fish screen costs, 1 to 210 CFS ( $\pm$ 25%) . . . . .	193
Figure 5.	Washington State fish screen costs, initial estimates . . . . .	194
Figure 9.	Fish screen cost estimates confidence level . . . . .	194
Table 1.	Agencies involved in the technical team initially developed for lower Clear Creek restoration . . . . .	198
Table 2.	Three optional solutions for solving fish passage problems at Saeltzer Dam on lower Clear Creek selected for detailed studies . . . . .	198
Table 3.	Comparison of three optional solutions to the fish passage problem at Saeltzer Dam located on lower Clear Creek . . . . .	199
Table 4.	The schedule for implementing the Saeltzer Dam Fish Passage and Flow Preservation Project on Clear Creek during the year 2000 . . . . .	203
Table 5.	Basic elements of the Saeltzer Dam Fish Passage and Flow Preservation Project on lower Clear Creek . . . . .	204
Figure 1.	Fish kill in unscreened part of diversion (fish in ditch between diversion point and screen, eastern Washington) . . . . .	206
Table 1.	ODFW Fish Screening Program, average fish screen costs . . . . .	207
Figure 2.	Paddle box screen (screen at ditch diversion point in Jack Creek, eastern Oregon; stream powers paddle; brush on one paddle cleans screen; 1 cfs) . . . . .	207
Figure 3.	Rotary drum screen (self-cleaning single drum screen; paddle powered; one-bay; John Day River Basin, eastern Oregon) . . . . .	208
Figure 4.	Rotary drum screen (self-cleaning drum screen; paddle powered; four-bay; Rogue River Basin, southwestern Oregon; 29 cfs) . . . . .	208
Figure 5.	Rotary drum screen (self-cleaning drum screen; electric powered; eastern Washington) . .	209
Figure 6.	Rotary drum screen (large drum screen, 19' in diameter; Red Bluff, California) . . . . .	209
Figure 7.	Traveling belt screen (eastern Washington) . . . . .	209
Figure 8.	Traveling belt screen (plastic; 10 cfs solar powered screen; eastern Oregon) . . . . .	209
Figure 9.	Self-cleaning panel screen (160 cfs wiper brush self-cleaning screen; electric powered; Parrot-Phelan Diversion in northern California) . . . . .	210
Figure 10.	Low velocity pump screen (Pump-Rite manually-cleaned pump screen; water velocity balance tube inside) . . . . .	210
Figure 11.	Clemons pump screen (self-cleaning pump screen . . . . .	211
Figure 12.	Sure-Flo pump screen (self-cleaning pump screen; water velocity balance tube inside) . .	211
Figure 13.	Fish screen bypass (bypass safely returns screened fish to stream; bypass can be very long, even hundreds of feet; eastern Oregon) . . . . .	211
Figure 14.	Screen bypass trap box (fish saved by screen are sorted by species and counted; steelhead smolts in box in photo; John Day River Basin, eastern Oregon) . . . . .	212
Table 1.	USACE programs for restoration: General Investigations Program . . . . .	221
Table 2.	Corp programs for restoration: Continuing Authorities Program . . . . .	222
Figure 1.	Joint Venture Management Board . . . . .	229
Table 1.	Habitat goals for the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture . . . . .	230
Table 2.	San Francisco Bay Joint Venture wetland habitat costs (in millions) by subregion . . . . .	232
Table 3.	Average cost rates for the SF Bay Joint Venture Implementation Strategy . . . . .	234
Table 1.	Restoration project data requirements for cost analysis, as suggested by workshop participants . . . . .	251